This Amendment is being filed in response to the Final Office Action of September 28, 2010. Reconsideration and allowance of the application in view of the amendments

made above and the remarks to follow are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-6, 9, 10, 12-20, 23-24, and 26-38 are pending in the Application. Claims 1, 15 and 28 are independent claims.

In the Final Office Action, claims 33-38 are objected to. In response, the objected claims are amended to correct the pointed out informality. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this objection be withdrawn.

In the Final Office Action, claims 1-3, 10, 15-17, 24 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2008/0066129 to Katcher ("Katcher") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,195,497 to Nagasaka ("Nagasaka"). Claims 4, 5, 9, 12, 13, 18, 19, 23 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Katcher in view of Nagasaka, in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0120935 to Huber ("Huber"). Claims 6 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Katcher in view of Nagasaka in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,553,347 to Tavor ("Tavor"). Claims 28 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Katcher in view of Nagasaka and Tavor. Claims 30 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Katcher in view of Nagasaka and in further view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0130983 to Rebane ("Rebane"). Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Katcher in view of Huber, Nagasaka and Tavor and in further view of Rebane. Claims 33-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Katcher in view of Nagasaka in further view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0056109 to Tomsen

("Tomsen"). Claims 37-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Natchel III view on Huber, Nagasaka, and Tavor and in further view of Tomsen.

The rejections of claims 1-6, 9, 10, 12-20, 23-24, and 26-38 is respectfully traversed. It is respectfully submitted that the claims are allowable over Katcher in view of Nagasaka alone, and in any combination with Huber, Tavor, Rebane and Tomsen for at least the following reasons.

The claims are amended to clarify its recitation so as to better relay the teaching of the present application, such as expressed in the present application, page 16, lines 9-11. There the specification explains that if the user requests products of region 2, which are not available for sale in the displayed frame, the system responds to the request in another frame where the requested product is available. In the response to the previous Office Action, terms first and second frame were used to argue this point. In response to that argument, the Examiner admitted (see page 6, lines 6-8 of the Office Action) that Katcher is silent about searching for a second frame or as worded in amended claim 1 "extracting from said first region enhanced content representative of the product of interest presented on the video program and if the enhanced content for the first region is not available, repeating the extracting of the enhanced content representative of the product of interest associated with the first region from the plurality of frames subsequent to the first frame".

With regard to Nagasaka, the sections referenced in the Final Office Action describe selecting subsequent frames of the display. As illustrated in Nagasaka, FIG. 3, when subject A is selected in the scene 1, the following displayed scene is scene 2 that also includes subject A. Similarly, when subject B is selected in the scene 2, the following

are registered. This tracing back on the basis of association to the index does not teach the above-quoted recitation of claim 1.

It is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is not anticipated or made obvious by the teachings of Katcher in view of Nagasaka, Huber, and Tavor. For example, Katcher in view of Nagasaka, Huber, and Tavor, does teach, disclose or suggest, a method that amongst other patentable elements, comprises (illustrative emphasis provided) "extracting from said first region enhanced content representative of the product of interest presented on the video program and if the enhanced content for the first region is not available, repeating the extracting of the enhanced content representative of the product of interest associated with the first region from the plurality of frames subsequent to the first frame", as recited in claim 1, and as substantially recited in each of claims 15 and 28. Rebane and Tomsen are cited for allegedly showing features of the dependent claims and as such, do not cure the deficiencies in Katcher in view of Nagasaka, Huber, and Tavor. 1-6, 9, 10, 12-20, 23-24, and 26-38

Based on the foregoing, the Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 15 and 28 are patentable and notice to this effect is earnestly solicited. Claims 2-6, 9, 10, 12-14, 16-20, 23-24 and 26-38 respectively depend from one of the independent claims and accordingly are allowable for at least this reason as well as for the separately patentable elements contained in each of said claims. Accordingly, separate consideration of each of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

In addition, Applicants deny any statement, position or averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, the Applicants reserve the right to submit further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

Applicants have made a diligent and sincere effort to place this application in condition for immediate allowance and notice to this effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory L. Thorne, Reg. 39,398

Attorney for Applicant(s) November 29, 2010

THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP

111 West Main Street Bay Shore, NY 11706

Tel: (631) 665-5139 Fax: (631) 665-5101